



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GREG ABBOTT

February 6, 2003

Ms. Angela M. DeLuca  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of College Station  
P.O. Box 9960  
College Station, Texas 77842

OR2003-0808

Dear Ms. DeLuca:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 176322.

The College Station Police Department (the "department") received a request for fourteen categories of information relating to a named police officer. You advise that you have redacted some responsive information pursuant to a previous determination issued by this office. *See* Open Records Decision No. 670 (2001) (allowing governmental body to withhold the home address, home telephone number, personal cellular phone number, personal pager number, social security number, and information that reveals whether the individual has family members, of a peace officer without the necessity of requesting an Attorney General decision as to whether the exception under section 552.117(2) applies); *see also* Gov't Code § 552.301(a) (allowing governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination). We note that you have not submitted information responsive to the requests for complaint and disciplinary information, training information, specialized unit information, evaluations, salary information, and overtime pay relating to the officer at issue. Therefore, we assume that, to the extent this information exists, it has been released to the requestor. If not, you must release it immediately. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (concluding that section 552.221(a) requires that information not excepted from disclosure must be released as soon as possible under the circumstances). You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108, the "law enforcement exception," provides in relevant part as follows:

- (a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the

requirements of 552.021 if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation or prosecution of crime; [or] (2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

Generally, a governmental body claiming an exception under section 552.108 must reasonably explain, if the information does not supply the explanation on its face, how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(b)(1); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You explain that the officer in question was the arresting officer in a DWI case that is currently pending in the Brazos County Court. You state that the officer's personnel information relates to the pending litigation because it could be used to undermine the officer's credibility, his competency to testify, and his qualification as an expert witness. Finally, you argue that the release of this information would interfere with the prosecution of this case. Based on your representations and our review of the information, we agree that the release of the submitted information "would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases); Open Records Decision No. 216 (1978). Accordingly, we conclude that the submitted personnel information may be withheld under section 552.108(a)(1). Because we are able to make a determination under section 552.108, we do not address your arguments under section 552.103.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public

records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



David R. Saldivar  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DRS/seg

Ref: ID# 176322

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jim W. James  
Law Office of Jim W. James  
P.O. Box 1146  
Bryan, Texas 77806  
(w/o enclosures)